



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,411	11/15/2006	Yoshihiro Naruse	TIP-06-1204	7152
35811	7590	01/25/2010		
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER LLP (US)		EXAMINER		
ONE LIBERTY PLACE		MATZEK, MATTHEW D		
1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103		1794		
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto.phil@dlapiper.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,411	Applicant(s) NARUSE ET AL.
	Examiner MATTHEW D. MATZEK	Art Unit 1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 84-157 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6,84-131,156 and 157 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 132-155 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III, claims 132-155, in the reply filed on 10/29/2009 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-6, 84-131, 156 and 157 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10/29/2009.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 6 is too light. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 132-155 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (US 2003/0106294 A1).

a. Chung et al. disclose nanofiber structures that may be used in filtering (abstract).

The structures may include a random distribution of fine polymer fibers having diameters of less than 200 nanometers [0006]. The polymer nanofibers may be formed via melt-spinning and be made of Nylon 6 [0004,8]. The random distribution of nanofibers forms a mat and may be adhered to a supporting substrate [0013]. This fine fiber mat may have a thickness of up to 100 times the fiber's diameter, yielding mats of up to 20 microns [0025]. The basis weight of the mat may be as low as 0.1 g/m². The space between fibers may range from 0.1 to about 10 microns [0006]. A coarse fiber layer of Chung et al. may have a permeability as low as 1.67cc/cm²/sec [0058, conversion done by Examiner], therefore the fine fiber layers would necessarily meet the claimed permeability as fine fiber layers of a filter have smaller pores leading to lower permeabilities when compared to coarse fiber layers.

b. The applied reference fails to provide what percentage of the nanofibers are in the sum Pa of single fiber ratios or the index of Pb; functions discussed in the specification by Applicant to describe uniformity in nanofiber diameter. The nanofiber diameter as

well as the percentage of the nanofibers are of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers and uniformity in fiber diameter provides increased uniform filter performance across and through filter media. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed sum Pa of single fiber ratios, index Pb of single fiber diameters, as well as the fiber diameters themselves, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

c. The freeness of the nanofiber mat as well as the average pore area and density are relative result-effective variables affecting permeability of the nanofiber mat. Decreasing freeness values as well as average pore area size increases the effectiveness of the filter by preventing the passage of ever smaller particles. An increase in density also leads to an increase in effectiveness of the filter in that there is less open space for particles to pass through. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed freeness, density and average pore size, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

d. Claim 141 is rejected as the fine fiber filter of Chung et al. has holes (pores) ranging from 0.01 to 25 microns [0006] therefore, the applied article would have zero holes with a diameter of 50 microns or more per cm². Claim 143 is rejected as the

nanofibers may be made of Nylon 6, a polyamide, which has a melting point of 216°C.

The fine fiber layer may be blended with other fibers [0014] and as discussed previously the diameter of the fibers used as well as the percentage of fibers of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers, but coarser fibers provide stability to the fine fiber layer. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed fiber diameters as well as their representation on percentage basis in the layer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

e. Claim 142 is rejected as the smoothness of the nanofiber layer of Chung et al. is a result-effective variable affecting the ability of the media being filtered to pass through the filter. Higher smoothness levels provide for less friction between fluid and filter causing a lower pressure drop through the filter, which extends the lifetime of the filter. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the smoothness, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize this result-effective variable by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

f. Claims 147-149 and 151-155 are rejected as the fine fiber layer may be laminated to conventional filter media [0061] such as woven or non-woven substrates (claim 121)

and may serve as a compound synthetic paper, filter, separator, abrasive or part of a medical product or circuit board.

g. Claim 150 is rejected as it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have molded the fine fiber layer to fit within a filtering apparatus. This is easily done since the fibers are made of a thermoplastic polymer.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 132-136, 138-140, 142, 145, 146 and 150-155 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 11/587,128.

a. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applied reference fails to provide what percentage of the nanofibers are in the sum Pa of single fiber ratios or the index of Pb; functions discussed in the specification by Applicant to describe uniformity in nanofiber diameter. The nanofiber diameter as well as what percentage of the nanofibers are of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers and uniformity in fiber diameter provides increased uniform filter performance across and through filter media. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed sum Pa of single fiber ratios, index Pb of single fiber diameters, as well as the fiber diameters themselves, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Claims 135, 139, 140, 142, 145, 146 and 150 are obvious over application '128 for the same reasons as set forth in the Chung et al. rejection.

b. The article of the '128 application may be used in the manner set forth in claims 151-155. Claims 136 and 138 are rejected as it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected a basis weight and density within the claimed ranges since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 132-135, 139, 140, 142, 145-147 and 149-155 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10, 12-16 of copending Application No. 11/578,926.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applied reference fails to provide what percentage of the nanofibers are in the sum Pa of single fiber ratios or the index of Pb; functions discussed in the specification by Applicant to describe uniformity in nanofiber diameter. The nanofiber diameter as well as what percentage of the nanofibers are of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers and uniformity in fiber diameter provides increased uniform filter performance across and through filter media. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed sum Pa of single fiber ratios, index Pb of single fiber diameters, as well as the fiber diameters themselves, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Claims 135, 139, 140, 142, 145, 146 and 150 are obvious over application '926 for the same reasons as set forth in the Chung et al. rejection. The article of the '926 application may be used in the manner set forth in claims 151-155.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 132-135, 144, 145, 146 and 150-155 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim1-16 of recently allowed Application No. 11/489,606.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applied reference fails to provide what percentage of the nanofibers are in the sum Pa of single fiber ratios or the index of Pb; functions discussed in the specification by Applicant to describe uniformity in nanofiber diameter. The nanofiber diameter as well as what percentage of the nanofibers are of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers and uniformity in fiber diameter provides increased uniform filter performance across and through filter media. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed sum Pa of single fiber ratios, index Pb of single fiber diameters, as well as the fiber diameters themselves, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Claim 150 is obvious over application '606 for the same reasons as set forth in the Chung et al. rejection. The article of the '606 application may be used in the manner set forth in claims 151-155.

8. Claims 132-135, 139, 140, 142, 143-155 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 10-12, 16-19, 53, 56, 57 and 59 of copending Application No. 10/532,082.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applied reference fails to provide what percentage of the nanofibers are in the sum Pa of single fiber ratios or the index of Pb; functions discussed in the specification by Applicant to describe uniformity in nanofiber diameter. The nanofiber diameter as well as what percentage of the nanofibers are of a given diameter are result-effective variables affecting the permeability, filter efficiency and effectiveness of the overall filter mat. Finer fibers will filter out smaller particulates than coarser fibers and uniformity in fiber diameter provides increased uniform filter performance across and through filter media. Consequently, absent a clear and convincing showing of unexpected results demonstrating the criticality of the claimed sum Pa of single fiber ratios, index Pb of single fiber diameters, as well as the fiber diameters themselves, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result-effective variables by routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Claims 135, 139, 140, 142, 145, 146 and 150 are obvious over application '926 for the same reasons as set forth in the Chung et al. rejection. The article of the '926 application may be used in the manner set forth in claims 151-155.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW D. MATZEK whose telephone number is (571)272-2423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Tarazano can be reached on 571.272.1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew D Matzek/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794